D. cancer, if only these two possess such an angulation surely this may be considered as one of the unusual if not unique characters of the latter larva.

As for the mandibles, I still believe these to be unique. I was careful, in view of possible discoveries, to say, (PSYCHE, Feb. '06, p. 19, last par.), in referring to the outer caudal angle of the mandible of other culicids than *Deinocerites* that "in other mandibles, *so far as the writer can ascertain*, this part forms an even, continuous curve with the rest of the mandible body." I had not then seen even the figure of *C. vector*. The straight, stiff, apparently spineless, (this is strange, as at least one or two rudimentary spines, though often hard to find, are present even on smoothly rounded mandibles), little projection on the outer angle of the mandible of *C. vector* is about as "similar" to the bent, thumblike, somewhat flexible, long-spined appendage on the *D. cancer* mandible as is the atrophied stump tail of a mandril to the prehensile caudal appendage of a South American monkey. Doubtless the projections are homologues. And, pray, on what are classifications based if not on modifications of homologous structures? Also, the outer angle of the mandible of *C. vector* is not, as in *D. cancer*, visible from above. The biting and other parts of the *C. vector* mandible are decidedly of the *Culex* type, as may be plainly seen by comparing them with my figure of a typical *Culex* mandible, (PSYCHE, Feb. '06, p. 11), and with the *Deinocerites* mandible illustrated on p. 17. (This figure, by the way, is, by a misprint, wrongly designated as "Maxilla of *C. salinarius*," which is on p. 20). For the description of a variation of the marginal comb, which agrees with *C. vector*, read par. 2, col. I, p. 13, of the same number.

I have, from the first, regarded *D. cancer* as a primitive type, and it is natural that later developed types should possess atrophied remnants of organs which were well developed in the more primitive forms (such for example, as the spines on the outer caudal angle of the mandible). I find this belief supported by Osten Sacken, who states that he considers the true Nemocera, to which the Culicidae belong, and most of which possess numerous well developed sensory hairs on the antennae, as being a higher development than the Nemocera anomala, which have relatively bare antennae, (Ent. Mon. Mag., XXVII, p. 35). He lays great stress on the characters of eyes and antennae for forming superfamilies among the Diptera. As in the true Nemocera the differentiation of eyes is reduced to a minimum, he gives to the antennal characters, especially the comparative length and abundance of the hairs on the male as compared with the female antennae, the greatest importance. If, then, so great an authority considers antennal characters of this nature as of such moment in differentiating *super*families, how much greater weight must be given to the value of the same characters in the making of *sub*families.